

Stakeholder Concerns, New EIPM Program	Summary
Primary goals and objectives of program?	
Focus on strengthening state IPM programs, ensuring at least one per state.	10 comments 4 CSREES Regions 7 Universities 1 Multi-State University Coalition 8 States/Territories 3 non-University Stakeholder Groups
State programs are dependent on EIPM funding to support core infrastructure, allowing for continuity and building staff expertise. Preserve infrastructure and statewide networks of IPM coordinators. To reduce duplication efforts, maximize program potential and ensure information is disseminated.	51 comments 5 CSREES Regions 14 Universities 11 Multi-State University Coalition 22 States/Territories 12 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Support diagnostic laboratories.	1 comment 1 CSREES Region 1 University 1 State/Territory
Allow for targeted programs, in addition to infrastructure.	2 Comments 2 CSREES Regions 2 States/Territories 1 University 1 University Multi-State Coalition
Funding should support states, not regional efforts, until funding pool is increased.	3 Comments 3 CSREES Regions 3 States/Territories 2 Universities 1 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Increase membership of regional committees to include representatives of all eligible institutions competing for 3(d) funds.	2 Comments 1 Region 2 States/Territories 1 University 1 Multi-State University Coalition
IPM programs should address needs identified by stakeholders at the state level.	8 Comments 4 CSREES Regions 7 States/Territories 5 Universities 2 Multi-State University Coalitions
How can funding be optimized?	
Foster collaboration, not competition between IPM programs.	6 Comments 4 CSREES Regions 6 States/Territories 5 Universities 1 Multi-State University Coalition
Divide funds in an equitable way to account for number of 1890 universities, diversity of crops and ecological CSREES Regions.	6 Comments 3 CSREES Regions 6 States/Territories 6 Universities
Flexibility in how funding can be used is greatly desired, so that states are able to respond to local needs.	4 Comments 2 CSREES Regions 4 States/Territories 3 Universities 1 Multi-State University Coalition

Minimize administrative costs by streamlining submission and review process, including considering electronic review panels.	3 Comments 1 CSREES Region 3 States/Territories 3 Universities
Ensure viability for new leveraging opportunities, which is threatened by competitive funding.	16 Comments 5 CSREES Regions 12 States/Territories 5 Universities 1 Multi-State University Coalition 3 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Do not require state matching funds.	14 Comments 1 CSREES Regions 1 States 1 University 5 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Provide level of base funding to all IPM programs, along with a second level of competitive funding to address local needs.	10 Comments 4 CSREES Regions 8 States/Territories 2 University 3 Multi-State University Coalitions 4 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Limit on proposal submissions?	
Limit submissions to one proposal per state.	6 Comments 3 CSREES Regions 5 States/Territories 4 University 1 Multi-State University Coalitions
Limit submissions to one proposal per institution.	20 Comments 5 CSREES Regions 1 States/Territories 14 University 7 Multi-State University Coalitions 4 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Proposal review and selection criteria?	
Require implementation of National IPM Roadmap.	9 Comments 3 CSREES Regions 6 States/Territories 5 University 2 Multi-State University Coalitions 1 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Award a high percentage of grants to increase probability of state funding.	16 Comments 1 CSREES Region 1 State/Territory 1 University 1 Multi-State University Coalition 6 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Fund both individual and multi-state efforts.	15 Comments 3 CSREES Regions 3 States/Territories 1 University 2 Multi-State University Coalitions 4 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Provide fair access to funds by smaller states and territories.	3 Comments 2 CSREES Regions 2 States/Territories 2 Universities

Provide a 45 day minimum proposal preparation time period.	2 Comments 1 CSREES Region 1 State/Territory 1 University
Funding approach: regional, multi-institutional or multi-state?	
Use a national funding approach in awards management – compete nationally.	15 Comments 2 CSREES Regions 2 States/Territories 1 University 1 Multi-State University Coalition 5 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Use a regional funding approach in awards management – competition within region.	5 Comments 4 CSREES Regions 5 States/Territories 3 Universities 1 Multi-State University Coalition 1 non-University Stakeholder Group
Use a statewide funding approach in awards management – one award per state.	26 Comments 3 CSREES Regions 8 States/Territories 5 Universities 3 Multi-State University Coalitions 8 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Use an institutional funding approach in awards management – one award per institution. Note: if multiple institutions per state, collaboration is encouraged.	4 Comments 2 CSREES Regions 3 States/Territories 2 Universities 2 Multi-State University Coalitions
Allow regional IPM centers to manage competitive process of distribution of funds.	5 Comments 2 CSREES Regions 3 States/Territories 1 Multi-State University Coalition 4 non-University Stakeholder Groups
No preference should be given to multi-state proposals.	4 Comments 4 CSREES Regions 4 States 4 University
Priority given to proposals addressing gaps in program coverage?	
Priority should be given to those programs that address gaps, such as organic IPM practices.	3 Comments 1 CSREES Region 1 State 1 University 1 Multi-State University Coalition 1 non-University Stakeholder Group
No priority should be given, as these gaps can be funded by other grant opportunities.	2 Comments 2 CSREES Regions 2 States/Territories 2 Universities
Funding limits and project duration?	
Cap funding level at highest level of state funding in 2008.	3 Comments 3 CSREES Regions 3 States/Territories 2 University 1 Multi-State University Coalition

Provide mechanism for long-term and multi-year funding commitments.	33 Comments 5 CSREES Regions 12 States/Territories 8 Universities 4 Multi-State University Coalitions 10 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Recommendations for transition to new program?	
Switch to competitive funding rewards successful programs and eliminates ineffective ones.	5 Comments 2 CSREES Regions 4 States/Territories 3 Universities 3 Multi-State University Coalitions 1 non-University Stakeholder Group
Maintain state funding, or quickly restore funding, under new guidelines.	12 Comments 4 Regions 9 States/Territories 7 Universities 11 Multi-State University Coalitions 1 non-University Stakeholder Group
Roll cotton IPM funding into general IPM funding pool.	6 Comments 1 Region 4 States/Territories 4 Universities 1 Multi-State University Coalitions
If cotton money will continue to be separate, add NM, AZ and CA into cotton pool.	1 Comment 1 Region 1 State/Territory 1 University
Incorporate recommendations from partners and state IPM coordinators.	6 Comments 3 CSREES Regions 4 States/Territories 2 Universities 1 Multi-State University Coalition 3 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Retract amendment to Farm Bill 2008 and revert to formula funding.	32 Comments 5 Regions 12 States/Territories 7 Universities 4 Multi-State University Coalitions 13 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Recommends USDA urge Congress to legislate a solution to address stakeholder concerns.	23 Comments 4 CSREES Regions 7 States/Territories 4 Universities 1 Multi-State University Coalition 11 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Request bridging funding, or greater transition time before new guidelines take place.	37 Comments 5 CSREES Regions 14 States/Territories 10 Universities 4 Multi-State University Coalitions 13 non-University Stakeholder Groups

Provide continuity during funding transition, especially regarding funded staff positions.	23 Comments 5 CSREES Regions 16 States/Territories 9 Universities 5 Multi-State University Coalitions 7 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Encourage smaller, less established programs to collaborate with a lead institution.	8 Comments 4 CSREES Regions 7 States/Territories 2 University 2 Multi-State University Coalitions 3 non-University Stakeholder Groups
Additional funds are requested in order to include 1890's.	1 Comment 1 CSREES Region 1 State/Territory 1 University
1994 Tribal Colleges should be partners in the state-based IPM programs.	1 Comment 1 CSREES Region 1 State/Territory 1 Multi-State University Coalition
Allow pre-award cost to be retroactive to October 1, 2008.	17 Comments 3 CSREES Regions 4 States/Territories 2 Universities 1 Multi-State University Coalition 7 non-University Stakeholder Groups